GP2743 # #5C 9-21-00

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Lester F. LUDWIG et al.

Application No.: 09/072,622 Group Art Unit: 2743

Filed: May 5, 1998 Examiner: M. Ramakrishnaiah

For: VIDEO CONFERENCING ON EXISTING UTP INFRASTRUCTURE

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

The following is submitted in response to the Office Action of May 9, 2000. Concurrently with this Response, Applicants are filing a Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time, and a payment of the one-month extension of time fee, thus extending the time period for response to September 9, 2000.

Claims 1-36 are all the claims pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 11-13, 14-19, 22-24, 25-28, 29-31, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Conway (US 5,444,476). The Examiner has rejected claims 9, 20, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conway in view of Nakajima (JP 401 252 087A.) The Examiner has rejected claims 10, 21 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Conway in view of Watanabe et al. (JP 402 089 482A). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and request reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims in view of the following arguments.

Regarding independent claims 1, 14 and 25, Conway describes a system for performing teleinteractive video teleconferencing between two or more teleconferencing sites whereby each and

every user may individually and simultaneously point within any video image transmitted as part of the video teleconference (column 3, lines 46-52). Conway describes the components of the system as comprising at each site video devices such as cameras and VCRs, local monitors for displaying local and remote images, communication sending and receiving modules. *See* Figure 1. However, Conway does not teach or suggest at least one unshielded twisted pair of wires, nor that video signals be transported over an unshielded twisted pair of wires, as required in independent claims 1, 14, and 25.

Further, the use of unshielded twisted pair wiring is not inherent in Conway. The devices recited in Conway are interconnected among themselves and to a communications network interface (column 5, lines 35-68, column 6, lines 1-40,) but Conway does not discuss nor specify the type of wiring that may be used. Even though per se wiring may be required in Conway's teleconferencing system, the type of wiring is not inherent. A person skilled in the art of telecommunications equipment would recognize that many types of wiring may be used, and that several types of wiring may be used in a specific application. Conway discloses no specific type of wiring for any specific use. Nothing in Conway teaches or suggests that unshielded twisted pair wiring is used, nothing is recited in the specification and claims, and nothing is so indicated by means of symbols on any of the accompanying figures. Therefore, Conway does not inherently or actually disclose the use of unshielded twisted pair wiring.

Further, Conway is silent on the quality of the video display whereas claims 6, 18, and 29 require the video images to be at least TV quality (Preliminary Amendment, April 14, 2000)*, which is exemplified in the specification as standard NTSC-quality TV performance, i.e., 30 frames per second at 640 x 480 pixels per frame and the equivalent of 24 bits of color per pixel (Application, page 9.) The mere presence of video cameras and video monitors in Conway does nothing to teach or suggest TV-quality transmission. Especially in view of the stilted or jerky motion provided in videoconferencing systems predating the effective filing date of the present application, it simply cannot be inferred from Conway that anything is being taught about transmission rate or quality of the images recited in the independent claims.

Nakajima describes a teleconferencing system which has the capacity to display both the local and the remote side images on a single monitor, and further describes a teleconferencing system wherein the video signal from each side has the images from two separate cameras. Thus at both the local and the remote site, each of two monitors displays an image which is a combined view of a local and a remote camera. Nothing in Nakajima suggests or implies the use of twisted pair wiring nor specifies the quality of the video image. Nakajima clearly does not disclose these features and the Conway-Nakajima combination does not anticipate nor render obvious the claimed invention.

---

* Applicants note that the Examiner apparently did not consider this Supplemental Amendment in the present Office Action, since there is reference to "20 frames per second" which was changed to --TV quality--. If the Examiner decides to change the rejection based on this language, the rejection cannot properly be made final.

For the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that the independent claims 1, 14, and 25 are patentable. Thus, claims 2-9, 11-13, 15-20, 22-24, 26-28, 29-32, and 34-36 which depend from patentable independent claims 1, 14, and 25 are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Regarding claims 10, 21 and 33, Watanabe et al. is directed at a video telephone set which incorporates a visual telephone directory as an aid to identifying a particular party to be called (Fig. 2, abstract). When a caller is uncertain of the identity or the phone number of the party to be called, the caller may invoke a visual directory and select the party to be called from a picture gallery. By referencing a number associated with each picture, the caller may initiate a call by selecting the appropriate number on a ten-key pad or the computer keyboard (abstract). Watanabe et al. does not disclose or suggest first and second graphical user interfaces, much less that a user can use these graphical user interfaces to select either a user or a collaboration type. To the contrary, the abstract of Watanabe et al. indicates that the caller makes his selection using a ten-key pad or the keyboard. A graphical user interface requires a pointing device such as a mouse or arrow keys, but Watanabe et al. fails to describe any such device. Thus, the Conway-Watanabe combination does not suggest the use of a graphical user interface to select *inter alia* collaboration types from a group of collaboration types. Consequently, Applicants submit that claims 10, 21, and 33 are patentable over Conway in view of Watanabe et al. for this additional reason as well.

Pursuant to the foregoing discussion, Applicants submit that claims 1-36 in the subject application are patentable.

The Examiner's rejections having been overcome, Applicants submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the

undersigned at the telephone number listed below to discuss other changes deemed necessary. Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank L. Bernstein
Registration No. 31,484

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
Tel: (650) 325-5800

Customer No. 23493

Date: September 8, 2000

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Date: September 8, 2000

Signed: Thea K. Wagner
Thea K. Wagner